UNITED
NATIONS

CERD

International Convention on
the Elimination
of all Forms of
Racial Discrimination

Distr.
GENERAL

CERD/C/SR.1351
23 August 1999

Original: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Fifty-fifth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1351st MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 13 August 1999, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ABOUL-NASR

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS, COMMENTS AND INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION (continued)

Twelfth to fifteenth periodic reports of Uruguay (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.99-43805 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS, COMMENTS AND INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION (agenda item 4) (continued)

Twelfth to fifteenth periodic reports of Uruguay (continued) (CERD/C/338/Add.7; HRI/CORE/1/Add.9/Rev.1)

1. At the invitation of the Chairman, the members of the delegation of Uruguay resumed their places at the Committee table.

2. Mrs. SADIQ ALI asked the delegation to explain the reasons why, as stated in paragraph 15 of the report of Uruguay (CERD/C/338/Add.7), there was a relatively smaller proportion of children and adolescents to adults among black females than among black males.

3. It would further be interesting to know why, unlike most other States parties, Uruguay gave international treaties lower status than the Constitution (report, para. 26). Although the State party claimed that it was in the vanguard of countries that had enacted legislation to combat racial discrimination (report, para. 33), article 149 of its Penal Code did not fully satisfy the requirements of article 4 (a), (b) and (c) of the Convention; did the Government have any plans to bring the Penal Code into closer conformity with article 4? She would appreciate elucidation of the last two sentences in paragraph 38; details of cases of anti-Semitism in which the State had intervened (report, para. 41), including the penalties meted out; clarification as to who the victims were in the case referred to in paragraph 42 of the report; and some forthright information on the pattern of racist practices in Uruguay, which appeared to be not uncommon.

4. In its General Recommendation XIX, the Committee gave a broader interpretation to article 3 of the Convention than did Uruguay (report, paras. 60-61). Article 3 prohibited racial segregation in all countries, not simply in South Africa, and it was particularly relevant to Uruguay, where housing posed a major problem for the blacks. She would like to know if the Government had a housing policy for them and if private employers helped them with housing. Also, it was not clear if the term "orientals" in paragraph 102 had the same meaning as the term "aliens from the Middle East" in paragraph 74.

5. The reference to the educational aspects of the Government's programmes to combat unemployment were particularly interesting. Uruguay should be congratulated for its secular, free and compulsory education, but the drop-out rate seemed inordinately high. What were the indicators and were there sufficiently trained teachers? The reference to household workers receiving no remuneration (report, para. 8) prompted the comment that the Government surely had the power to put an end to such exploitation.

6. Mr. FERRERO COSTA underscored the very interesting and helpful demographic statistics provided in various parts of the report. He noted, however, that in the breakdown of races given in paragraph 16 there was no mention of Jews, although elsewhere in the report the Government recognized the Jewish community as a separate one.

7. The report spoke of two schools of thought regarding the hierarchy of domestic law vis-à-vis the international treaties to which Uruguay was a party: the majority opinion that domestic law prevailed (para. 26); and the alternative view that human rights treaties had precedence in cases of conflict (para. 27). He wished to know more about the reasoning behind the second view, about any cases in which the courts had taken a position on either side, and about the Government's position. He noted the very broad wording of article 8 of the Constitution as cited in the report (para. 36); if international treaties did not have precedence over the Constitution, it would be very important for the Constitution to specifically ban racial discrimination. Similarly, the very interesting "natural law" approach of article 72 of the Constitution (report, para. 38), wherein rights were not established but provision was made for their protection, might also have important implications for the implementation of the Convention, and he would appreciate a fuller development of the legal thinking on that point.

8. He would like more information on the investigations carried out by the special commission set up to investigate the existence of Nazi funds in the international financial system (report, para. 62), and the conclusions the commission had reached.

9. Although the report (para. 63) claimed that the various races living in the country enjoyed complete de jure and de facto equality of civil and political rights, it said elsewhere that the blacks were marginalized in respect of both employment and education: how could those two statements be reconciled? It was clear from the current and earlier reports that the blacks were very disadvantaged, and it would be useful to learn what measures the Government had taken or would take to overcome discrimination against them, in keeping with article 2, paragraph 2, and article 5 of the Convention. He would like to know more about the restrictions on the admission of persons belonging to certain ethnic groups to public places, and what the Government's position was on article 5 (f) of the Convention.

10. Mr. VALENCIA RODRIGUEZ said that the useful population statistics provided in the report made it clear that Uruguay was a multi-ethnic society, which meant that the Convention was especially relevant. Although in general the constitutional protections were strong and international treaties could be invoked directly in the courts he hoped that the view on the status of international treaties in Uruguay given in paragraph 27 of the report would prevail. Paragraphs 36 to 38 and 42 of the report indicated a very favourable human rights climate in Uruguay, which the Government should encourage through active promotion of tolerance and understanding among the different groups.

11. Useful information had been provided on the legal machinery for protecting human rights, and it would be interesting to know if there had been any cases of racial discrimination that had involved recourse to habeas corpus or amparo. He would also like to know whether the Government had taken any measures under article 2 to redress discrimination against the black, indigenous and other minority groups. The Government should develop broad programmes, with the participation of representatives of those minorities, in order to improve their conditions.

12. Article 149 bis of the Penal Code (report, para. 33) only partly satisfied the requirements of article 4 of the Convention because it did not specifically penalize organizations which incited to racial hatred. Elsewhere, however, the Penal Code sanctioned criminal association (report, para. 69). The Government should review its legislation for conformity with article 4.

13. Under article 5, exemplary provisions were in place for political participation by aliens (report, para. 71) and more information on the subject would be appreciated.

14. An extremely interesting segment of the report provided employment data according to racial group. Employment was lower among blacks and indigenous persons than among whites and doubly low among minority women, which meant that the Government must adopt a gender perspective to correct the situation.

15. Praiseworthy advances had been made in education and Uruguay's illiteracy rate was rather low in comparison with the other countries of the region, but he would like to know the percentage of illiteracy among blacks, indigenous persons and other minorities. More information was requested about government action to improve the reportedly low levels of schooling completed by blacks (para. 155). Significant steps had clearly been taken (report, paras. 161 et seq.) to teach tolerance, understanding and awareness of the cultural identity of minorities in the schools elsewhere.

16. Lastly, he would like to know whether there had been any court cases that had involved refusing blacks admission to public places and what the outcome had been.

17. Mr. DIACONU praised the effort that had gone into the special survey held to gather the statistics provided in the report. The Government itself would be able to draw conclusions from them that would be very useful for its economic and social policies.

18. The next report should give more attention to ethnic and national groups other than the Jewish community, and not simply to social groups. Regarding nationality, nothing had been said in paragraph 77 of the report about the process of naturalization and he wondered if there was any discrimination in that area. He would also like information on the Government's policy to reduce the disparities in access to employment shown in paragraph 100 of the report. He noted that education was free at all levels, a fine achievement, but asked whether education was provided in Spanish only.

19. Mr. YUTZIS said that, despite the long interval since the submission of Uruguay's previous periodic reports, that country's authorities had shown their willingness to maintain a dialogue with the Committee.

20. He was interested in the contention that Uruguay was a homogeneous society and that the existence of minorities, in the sense accepted in many other countries, was not recognized. He recalled an exchange, in April 1995, between the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the then leader of the Chamber of Representatives, which had revealed that the definition contained in the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic,

Religious and Linguistic Minorities was not conducive to precise interpretation. It seemed to him that the Committee saw two ways of defining a minority. One was subjective, when a community saw itself as a minority; the other was objective, linked to the conditions in which the members of the group found themselves and the way they were perceived by others. And in Uruguay, as anywhere, there were discernible racial differences marked by skin colour and other features. Article 1, paragraph 1, of the Convention offered no clear definition of minority but did provide a basis for the Committee's understanding that it was possible for situations to occur which could be seen as discrimination against a minority.

21. With reference to paragraph 72 of the report, he wondered why the Jewish community alone had been singled out. He felt sure that domestic census data existed from which more information could have been gleaned. Further information on the Jewish community was given in paragraphs 41 and 62. While bearing in mind the terrible history of persecution against that community, he noted that the latter now had available powerful international resources for action and wondered, therefore, why details were lacking about attention to the black and other sectors of society.

22. With reference to the rights to property ownership (paras. 82 to 85) and the right to work (paras. 87 et seq.), it should be borne in mind that proclaimed rights and freedoms were one thing but the ability to assert them was another. In particular, the current widespread unemployment throughout Latin America in general, and particularly in the Southern Cone, could foster a climate of discrimination against which the State should be prepared to take measures.

23. Mr. de GOUTTES said that the fifteenth periodic report was much more comprehensive than that considered in 1991 and responded to many of the questions raised by the Committee at that time. The demographic breakdown by race was shown in paragraph 13; but there was no specific information on the status of the black, indigenous and oriental sectors of the population with regard to matters such as education and access to employment in the public service. According to paragraph 72, no general statistical data were available to show the number of persons of each race in the various branches of public employment. He wondered why there was no mention of the situation relating to population sectors other than the Jewish community, especially since, according to a report by SOS Racismo/Mundo Afro, there were indications, referred to by the Country Rapporteur, of discrimination against blacks in matters such as employment, education, health and the status of women. It seemed that Uruguay, unlike some other Latin American countries, implemented no special policy or legal norms in favour of the black and indigenous sectors of the population.

24. On the question of the application of international law at the domestic level (report, paras. 25 to 29) and the apparent absence of a specific definition of the domestic status of treaties, he noted that there was reportedly a growing tendency for the courts to invoke international instruments, and would appreciate some examples.

25. With reference to article 149 of the Penal Code (para. 33), he asked whether the law could be applied against organizations and associations as well as individuals. He would also like to know whether there had been any cases of recourse to amparo in situations of racial discrimination.

26. Mr. BANTON, referring to paragraph 169 of the report, asked whether it would not be simpler, in cases of persistent refusal by a club or public place of entertainment to admit persons on grounds of race, to revoke the licence.

27. Mr. SHAHI, drawing attention to the statement in paragraph 70 that every Uruguayan citizen partook of the sovereignty of the nation, said in that regard that he, like other members, had noted the reference in paragraph 72 to members of the Jewish community. It seemed that other groups were under-represented in Parliament, public service and the executive - a matter which called for affirmative government action. The unemployment rates given in the tables following paragraph 115 showed some striking disparities, for example between black and white men.

28. With reference to article 4 of the Convention, he shared the concern voiced by other members about the shortcomings of Uruguayan legislation and endorsed the questions asked, in particular, about article 149 of the Penal Code. Lastly, with regard to paragraph 169 of the report, he thought that Mr. Banton's suggestion about revoking a licence could be an effective sanction.

29. The CHAIRMAN said he shared the concern expressed about the lack of information and action with regard to indigenous citizens and persons of African origin.

30. Mr. SEMINO (Uruguay) said that his delegation would do its best to provide answers to the questions raised and dispel some misunderstandings that might have arisen on account, in particular, of differences in concepts and cultural backgrounds. For instance, the Uruguayan Government maintained that there were no minorities in the country in the sense of communities such as the Sudeten community in the Czech Republic. It would be difficult to argue the point, but perhaps the Uruguayan view could be more fully expounded in the next periodic report, which might likewise deal with any other topics which the Committee felt needed clarification in the current report. In that regard, the racial groupings set out in paragraph 13 of the report had been compiled in an effort to conform as closely as possible to the Committee's guidelines but did not necessarily reflect the way in which the Uruguayan authorities would have compiled the information. The "orientals" mentioned in the paragraph were mostly citizens of Chinese, Japanese and Korean origin. The figures for the white population included persons of Arab origin, who were for the most part Christians of Lebanese origin.

31. Paragraph 43 of the report, which some members of the Committee had criticized, was perhaps unclear. The law distinguished, in fact, between incitement to moral or physical violence on grounds of race, for which persons found guilty were liable to 6 to 18 months' imprisonment, and actual commission of acts of violence, for which sentences ranged from 6 to 24 months' imprisonment. Organizations and associations, as well as individuals, could be prosecuted, and the mere fact of being associated with

some entity in the commission of criminal acts could result in a prison sentence varying from 6 months to 2-5 years. A case had been reported only the previous day of action taken against a group which had made threats against Jews and disseminated racist propaganda on the Internet. Between 15 and 25 persons had been arrested and charged under article 150 of the Penal Code. That instance reflected the authorities' determination to clamp down promptly on any such manifestations.

32. It had so far proved impossible to establish the identity of those responsible for the desecration of the Jewish cemetery referred to in paragraph 41 of the report, and the Comité Central Israelita, which had filed the complaint, had since considered the case closed. In both cases of discrimination described in paragraph 43 the companies involved had taken sanctions against their employees who had offended blacks, and Club Neptuno, the fitness club, had gone so far as to dismiss the employee in question.

33. There was no information available on how often black or indigenous people had resorted to remedies of habeas corpus or amparo in cases involving racial discrimination. The delegation could only request such information from the judicial branch in Montevideo, but since the country had no census data on racial composition it would be difficult on the basis of court records to establish the race of applicants for those remedies.

34. With regard to the work of the commission set up to investigate the possible existence of funds from Nazi Germany (report, para. 62), that body had established after a lengthy investigation that there had been no trafficking of Jewish money by Nazis during the Second World War in Uruguay, and both the Comité Central Israelita and the World Jewish Congress had expressed their satisfaction with the transparency of the banking system and with the effort made by the Government, Uruguay having been among the first countries to respond to their concerns.

35. A number of Committee members had raised the question of political rights guaranteed under article 5 of the Convention. The participation of Jews in Parliament had nothing to do with race or religion, but simply resulted from the fact that Jewish people had become members of the main political parties which had received sufficient votes under the country's strict proportional representation system to hold parliamentary seats.

36. Mundo Afro had referred to the under-representation of blacks and Indians in Parliament, the public administration and the Government, and also on the absence of black members of trade unions. That was an interesting point, as trade unions in Uruguay were completely independent of the Government and tended to be critical of government policy, yet they themselves did not consider the situation of black workers to be a specific problem. As to representation in the public service, the President of the Republic from 1915 to 1919, Dr. Feliciano Viera, had been of mixed race (mestizo); a prominent army general in the 1850s and 1860s had been an Indian, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had not only black doormen, as was claimed, but also black and mestizo diplomats. The senator who had recently replaced the President of the Republic during his trip abroad was a mestizo of black and Indian origin. There were indeed marginalized black people in the country, but that was not the full picture. There were also others who had risen to

senior posts, including administrators and television anchormen. When the black captain of the Uruguayan national football team had died, a State funeral had been held. Blacks had made a substantial contribution to the country's culture in the arts, dance and music.

37. The immigration laws which had included racially discriminatory provisions had dated from the 1890s, and had been repealed. A new bill which had no discriminatory provisions was before Parliament. Passage would take some time, as the country was about to hold elections, but the delegation would forward a copy of the bill to the Committee for information.

38. The legal provisions concerning the legal age for marriage dated back to 1868, when it had been socially acceptable for women to marry when they were 12 years old, the age at which they were biologically capable of bearing children. Clearly, that archaic provision of the Civil Code needed to be updated. The Committee's concerns would be transmitted to the Government. In practice, however, Committee members could rest assured that no one married that early in modern-day Uruguay.

39. The right to own property was subject to no restrictions, although such a right was admittedly only theoretical for those who could not afford to buy property in the first place. Uruguay had nationalized the major public services and established a generalized State pension fund before many European countries, and before any other Latin American countries. Among the countries in the region, the distribution of wealth in Uruguay was the most equitable and the proportion of people living in poverty, at 4 per cent, was the lowest.

40. Some 65 per cent of Uruguayans owned their own homes, and the Government maintained a general policy aimed at supporting disadvantaged citizens regardless of colour, race or religion who wished to purchase housing, inter alia by providing generous loans. As a result the housing in the country was generally of good quality, and in recent years tens of thousands of units had been built for disadvantaged families. Some poor housing subsisted, mainly in rural areas, and active efforts had been made to improve the situation in such areas by building housing and providing amenities. But the percentage of the population living in such conditions was very low indeed, as the countryside, primarily given over to livestock breeding, with little labour-intensive agriculture, was nearly deserted. Most of the population lived in urban areas.

41. The statistics on the relative income of blacks and whites could be misleading. The fact that blacks generally earned 60 per cent of what whites earned did not mean that a black who did the same job as a white received less money, but rather reflected a more general difference in the types of employment performed. Mundo Afro claimed that some 65 per cent of black women worked as domestic employees, but according to the Government's statistical office the figure was closer to 30 per cent. Domestic employees in Uruguay were covered by the national pension fund, to which their employers were obliged to contribute. Although the work itself was not easy, it could in no way be compared to slavery.

42. Indigenous people, who represented 0.4 per cent of the population in Uruguay, were rarely encountered but were on the whole well received by the

population. The country's name, the names of all its rivers and many of the first names given to Uruguayan children were all of Guaraní origin, as were the names of many prominent public figures.

43. The only restrictions on the freedom to choose one's place of residence stemmed from the economic constraints imposed by a market economy. Arabs, for instance, lived in all parts of Montevideo, in both fashionable residential and more modest districts. Under the military dictatorship the primarily black residents of a specific city block - though not of an entire district, as claimed - had indeed been evicted. The delegation could not say whether or not the evicted tenants had received promises from the Government but had requested that information from the authorities in Montevideo and would report to the Committee in due course. In any case those families had been forced to leave a picturesque area and live elsewhere, but they had not been replaced by whites. The block had been demolished and the plot was still vacant.

44. The Government had initiated an awareness campaign in secondary schools and elsewhere on the provisions of the Convention, and an agreement had been concluded for university professors to conduct courses on human rights, including the provisions of the Convention, at the national police academy.

45. Concerning the ratification of the amendments to article 8 of the Convention, the delegation would convey the Committee's concerns to the Government.

46. People who could not afford a lawyer did not go without counsel, as all law students in Uruguay were obliged to serve on a pro bono basis in the legal offices of the law school, which was open 24 hours a day. The legal office of the judiciary too could assign government-funded lawyers to defend persons who could not afford counsel.

47. A complete reply to questions about article 72 of the Constitution would require both an explanation of how that article was interpreted by the courts and a definition of its scope. The Uruguayan Constitution had been inspired to some extent by the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America, which referred to inalienable rights endowed on men by their Creator. In deference to the separation of church and State, the Uruguayan Constitution simply referred to rights as "inherent", which could mean that they were either endowed by God or simply by nature. In any event, human rights were not granted by some instrument, but existed from birth or conception. Article 72 was a key section of the Uruguayan Constitution; most importantly, its flexible wording made it possible for the courts to bestow upon any right considered to derive from jus naturale the status of an inherent right under Uruguayan law. For example, freedom of artistic creation and copyright, which had not been included in the Constitution, were recognized by virtue of the interpretation of article 72. Because of its flexibility, professors of constitutional and criminal law invoked article 72 regularly before the courts.

48. Amparo, which was described in paragraphs 56 to 59 of the report and was a procedure that had first appeared in the Americas in the Mexican Constitution of 1857, provided a quick and effective remedy in cases where manifest and blatant violations of the law took place; it was widely used in

courts in Uruguay and was often invoked when there were no other expedient means of restoring legality. He himself had drafted the Government's bill on amparo which had ultimately been adopted by Parliament.

49. Article 332 of the Constitution gave judges some scope to deal with cases that were not covered specifically by other articles. After all, Uruguayan legislators were not omniscient and could not imagine every case which might possibly arise. It was not, however, possible to use the article as a pretext for inventing new offences. A few years before, two Cuban immigrants had gone on hunger strike, a situation which was not provided for in Uruguayan law, except that a person who died on hunger strike was considered to have committed suicide. On the authority of article 332, the judge in that case had been able to draw on relevant legislation from similar legal systems, namely the Western liberal systems of law, and generally accepted doctrines in order to settle the case.

50. Under article 7 of the Constitution, all residents of Uruguay, whether citizens or non-citizens and regardless of race or colour, were guaranteed certain basic rights, including the rights to life, liberty, security of person, work and property ownership. It was true that the Constitution did not specifically prohibit racial discrimination. However, he considered that the articles he had cited were wide-ranging enough to afford the necessary guarantees.

51. Acts of racial discrimination or incitement to racial hatred counted as public offences, and the State would investigate them whether the victim lodged a formal complaint or not. That was not the case with sex crimes, for example, where in the interests of individual privacy cases were not investigated without a formal complaint.

52. Turning to employment policy, he said that there were, naturally, differences in the levels of employment of the black and the white population. Government action was intended to alleviate all poverty and provide equal opportunities for the whole population. According to United Nations figures dating from July 1999, 4 per cent of the population lived below the poverty line. The black population was a vulnerable one, and would therefore benefit from government measures in such fields as housing and amenities.

53. On the subject of free access to public places, he said that municipalities were responsible for the prevention of discrimination in public places such as nightclubs, cinemas and stadiums. If a deliberate act of discrimination took place, the owner would be prosecuted and the establishment closed down. He had not heard of many such cases, which he took to be a good sign, since the press and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) stood ready to denounce any cases of discrimination which did occur. Of course, as in any society, there were bound to be some Uruguayans who were prejudiced against blacks, or Jews, or Basques, or even people of Italian descent such as himself, and the law, the amparo procedure or the Convention were not going to change their views overnight.

54. Another point to be made in connection with the representation of blacks in senior positions was that the black population of Uruguay was very small. Of the 5.9 per cent of the population which was wholly or partly of black

ethnic origin, only 30,000 people, or 0.9 per cent of the total population, were strictly speaking black. Considering that the total population was over 3 million, there were bound to be only a few blacks in evidence in any one place. There was nothing to prevent black people moving to Uruguay, so perhaps there would be more of them in future.

55. He did not have detailed data on child mortality or life expectancy among the black or indigenous populations, but he would ensure that such information was included in the next report.

56. On the subject of the applicability of the Convention vis-à-vis domestic law, he said that the issue was a very complicated one, and his delegation would submit a full explanation in writing. There was no specific provision which stated that international treaties took precedence over domestic legislation, or vice versa - it was up to the judge in every case to decide. Uruguay had signed the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, but it had not yet ratified it because its provisions concerning the prosecution of a head of State were not compatible with Uruguay's own legislation.

57. The official language of the country, and the language of instruction in all schools, was Spanish. Of course, it was possible to learn other languages, and classes were available in, for example, Italian, Basque and Arabic.

58. Candidates for the presidency or vice-presidency must be Uruguayan nationals, i.e. they must have been born in the country or have a Uruguayan father or mother. For all other senior posts, up to and including President of the Supreme Court, the candidate must be a Uruguayan citizen. A person could acquire Uruguayan citizenship by fulfilling a residence requirement and going through the relevant procedure. There were no differences between citizens and non-citizens in respect of social security or employment law.

59. The question of the definition of a minority group was a very complex one. The black and indigenous residents of Uruguay were Uruguayans: they shared the same culture, wore the same clothes and ate the same food as the rest of the population. They belonged to a variety of religions, or none at all. He saw no need to differentiate between the various groups. Black and indigenous people were free to form their own political parties if they wished: one such party had been formed in 1937, but it had folded for lack of interest. A political party based on an ethnic group, such as a Chinese or an Arab party, was alien to Uruguayan tradition. Black people were free to join mainstream political parties, although none had been elected to high office.

60. Members had rightly pointed out that the report gave a great deal of information about the Jewish population of Uruguay, and not so much about the black and indigenous population. A Jewish organization, the Comité Central Israelita, had helped to prepare the report. Perhaps black and indigenous organizations had not been so willing to cooperate. It might be that the legacy of the Holocaust had made the Jewish population more sensitive to human rights issues. The Jewish population was perfectly integrated into Uruguayan society, and it was not specified in census returns, for example, whether a person was Jewish, Protestant, Catholic or Baha'i.

61. Likewise, he had little information about the Italian and Spanish populations of Uruguay. One third of the population was of Italian descent, and there was also a large Spanish population, particularly in Montevideo. However, both populations had become fully integrated into Uruguayan society, to which they had made a valuable contribution.

62. The CHAIRMAN said that, while he had no wish to belittle the sufferings of the Jews, blacks had also suffered considerably during their centuries of slavery.

63. Mr. WOLFRUM said that the Uruguayan delegation did not seem to have taken the Committee's concerns about the African community seriously enough. The representative had spoken of black families being moved from their homes, and had said that the site was still unoccupied. To him, that merely meant that people had been moved without even the justification that new and better housing would be built on the same spot.

64. Ms. ZOU Deci (Country Rapporteur) thanked the Uruguayan delegation for its frank dialogue with the Committee. The Uruguayan Government had done a great deal to improve living standards and establish the rule of law, but many de facto inequalities and examples of racial discrimination still remained in Uruguayan society, particularly in respect of the black population. She hoped that, in its next periodic report, the Government would give more information about the situation of the black population, as well as more details about the implementation of article 4 of the Convention, which was a mandatory article, including the ways in which the provisions of that article could be reflected in the Penal Code.

65. The CHAIRMAN thanked the Uruguayan delegation for its report and its dialogue with the Committee.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.